



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

EDUCATIONAL MOVEMENTS IN ENGLAND

II

IN September of last year I gave in the REVIEW a sketch of existing educational institutions in England and called attention to the "deep and widespread ferment" that possessed the educational mind of that country. Since then a great thing has happened. The dreams of educational reformers and the plots and plans of educational politicians have mingled to bear practical fruit, and out of the mists and chaos of this great ferment two schemes of hope and promise have crystallized into action. Whether the action results in good or evil—whether it is the sowing of that grain of educational mustard seed, which will one day become the greatest among educational herbs, so that the birds of scattered effort and inchoate experiment will come and lodge in the branches thereof, or whether it is only another specimen of that putting of new cloth unto an old garment, whereby the rent is made worse, the recent action of the government marks the beginning of a new era—the era of action following on the era of thought. At last two definite proposals have been set before parliament, and the war of theories has been changed into a war of effort. Action having taken the place of thought, some definite accomplishment must soon be reached. Even if the Board of Education Bill should never be passed and the University of London Act bear only dead fruit, the organization of Secondary Education and the Creation of a Teaching University for London will never again be allowed to slip back into the region of theory. Something will surely be done, and will become the foundation of an educational structure which will begin to grow and in due time reach completion.

Beside these items of news all other matters sink into insignificance, and I shall therefore devote this letter to these two achievements and the history of the movements which led up to them, reserving for my next letter an account of the reception

accorded to them and the various criticisms passed upon them by the educational world of England.

At Easter of last year the Teachers' Guild held its annual general meeting in the University College of Wales, Aberystwyth. This body, as I pointed out in my first letter, contains among its members representatives of all degrees of educational standing and all shades of educational opinion. Its annual report may therefore be taken as reflecting a widespread and comprehensive opinion, and the following extracts, taken from the beginning and end, have a peculiar interest in view of what has happened since.

"Introductory.—An uneventful year—a year of many expectations and no results in the field of educational politics—thus the Council must describe the last twelve months. There is a singular agreement among teachers in favor of the main recommendations of the late Royal Commission on Secondary Education. All persons who have given any serious thought to the matter unite in insisting on the supreme importance of raising the educational facilities and endowment of the nation to the highest point, and of losing no time over the process—but nothing is done. A year is but a short while in the history of a people, but when it is not the first or second in a series of years of baffled hopes, impatience grows. It is surely a grave defect in our system of government, and the realization of it comes home to all of us in turn, whatever our special interest may be, that no large constructive measures can be got through Parliament till the whole electorate is roused to demand them. Till then those who have long divined our needs in any direction must sit still and possess their souls in patience

"The Educational Outlook.—Over and beyond the need for immediate missionary effort on which the Council have insisted earlier in their Report, is there not an obvious duty cast on an Association such as ours is, stretching through several years to come? We hold that, in view of the hearty approval won by the Royal Commission's Report, we must to the best of our ability resist, in union with other Educational Associations, *piecemeal* legislation for education, and, if our resistance is

unable to arrest it, we must do what we can to minimize its evil effects. Perhaps we may find that a better thing than such legislation would be the utilization of existing forces to the utmost to secure educational ends. The cue for this has been more than once clearly given to us by the Vice-President of the Committee of Council himself in recent public utterances. If a Government, such as we have, with an unusually large and homogeneous majority in both Houses, cannot embody in a grand measure of constructive legislation what is wanted for the organization of education, is there any chance of our getting it from any other arrangement of Parliamentary forces? Failing an efficient Registration Act cannot the Universities of the United Kingdom form a Joint Board for the constitution of a University Register of Teachers? It would be a Directory only, without State sanctions attached to it, but it would be a Directory which all could respect. The satisfactory training of all teachers could surely be much forwarded by the teaching profession and the public without the intervention of the Legislature. Might not existing Educational Authorities, having existing powers, do much that has not yet been attempted to arrest waste of effort and overlapping? United and consistent action on the part of County Council Education Committees could save us from the folly of putting a solid technical coping-stone on an unstable educational building, by securing the best advanced general education for all who are destined for technical pursuits. As it is we are largely degrading Secondary Education through the operation of Parliamentary bribes, administered with good intentions and evil results, while we are imitating the foreigner in the advanced stages, which cannot be profitably adjusted to those which are lower while they are in their present state. There is danger in leaping at ends excellent in themselves over chasms which should be slowly and carefully bridged. It is thoroughness that makes the best pace, and it is the champions of education in the fullest sense—the teacher's sense of the word—who are after all proved to be the men of the world also, the practical people, with the added advantage that they can see a few years ahead.

“To sum up. Let the Guild use all its influence against scrappy legislation for the organization of education ; let it work for the utmost reforms that can be made without the help of Parliament, and let it strive to resist the degradation of Secondary Education through short-sighted panic as to loss of trade. With the help of all the component units of the Guild the Council feel that they can do something towards these ends, but it must be real help, born of steady unswerving devotion to the light and inspired by faith in Education as the developer of faculty and of the fully-rounded man, if it is to do its share in brushing aside attempts, from whatever quarter they may come, to foist mere Instruction on us in the place of Education, and lead us along the royal road to—Nowhere.”

This is an able pronouncement of the case for organization, with the ring of that sane idealism which in the long run is the most paying practicalness.

In *Education*, the organ of the incorporated Association of Head Masters, on June 25 appeared an interesting article suggested, apparently, by one of the many attempts at excellent but “piecemeal” legislation—the private bill introduced into parliament by the Association, sometimes known as Colonel Lockwood’s Bill, from the member who took charge of it. From this article I cull the following facts in relation to the history of the movement which has resulted in the Board of Education Bill, or Secondary Education Bill, as it is more generally called.

In 1879 the first Secondary Education Bill was drafted by the College of Preceptors, being limited to registration of teachers. It reappeared in the sessions of 1881 and 1890. In this last year the Teachers Guild drafted a rival bill, and a Select Committee of the House of Commons was appointed to adjudicate between the rival bills. Eight years have elapsed and the Private Bill now before parliament is backed by five societies of secondary teachers. In the interval the Blue Book literature has been enriched by nine volumes of Report on Secondary Education—the Recommendations of the Royal Commission on Secondary Education, which reported in 1895, and was followed by the abortive government bills of 1896, which satisfied

no one and were withdrawn. The latest bill deals, of course, with many other matters besides registration.

This was written in June, after Colonel Lockwood's Bill had been introduced on the 15th of that month. The Board of Education Bill was introduced into parliament on the 1st of August.

But, before drafting their bill, the Government made certain preliminary inquiries — a census, in fact, of secondary schools, which was issued in May as a Blue Book entitled "Return of the Pupils in public and private Secondary and other Schools (not being public Elementary or Technical Schools) in England, excluding Monmouthshire, and of the teaching staff in such Schools." This return is an impressive demonstration of the complexity of the problem before educationists and the obscurity in which time and the fungus growths of tradition have involved its details. I have space only to cite a few remarkable revelations.

The existing secondary schools of England (Monmouthshire being excluded), allowing for the few who declined to make returns, do not exceed 7000. There are 46,617 boys in private schools as against 59,517 in endowed schools. On the other hand the girls in private schools number 80,000, as against only 14,000 in endowed schools. More than half the private schools muster only 30 pupils, or even less. Considering only the regular staff in boys' schools, over 40 per cent. of the teachers, it seems, are not graduates in the English sense, *i. e.*, holders of a university degree. Even in endowed schools the percentage only rises to 64. In private schools it falls much lower. Thirty two per cent. of the whole number of boy schools have no graduate on the regular staff, even when the head master is reckoned in. Anent these facts the *Journal of Education* makes the following sane remarks. "It is nothing short of astounding, when University education has become so general and so accessible, that a third of the whole number of boys' schools should be under the entire control of non-graduates. Of course a man may be well educated and a good teacher without a University diploma, but, as a matter of fact, in far the majority of cases,

the non-graduate schoolmaster has drifted into the teaching profession because he could find nothing else to do, and not because he had any special aptitude. Again we are brought face to face with the need of training. Small wonder is it that the teaching profession has sometimes to submit to obloquy when, as may fairly be assumed from these tables, about half of its members do not possess even the minimum of book knowledge required for a non-resident degree. . . . Perhaps the main lesson to be drawn from this return is that the general provision for secondary education throughout the country is quite inadequate."

I will now give a very brief outline of Colonel Lockwood's Bill, followed by a more detailed account of the Board of Education Bill, prefacing both with a summary of the recommendations of the Royal Commission of 1895.

The Commission recommended —

(1) *An Executive Education Department or Central Authority* for secondary education, with a responsible Minister, which should absorb the Endowed Schools Commissioners and the Science and Art Department.

(2) *An Educational Council*, nominated partly by the Crown, partly by the Universities, and leavened with experienced teachers by co-optation, to be independent of the Minister "professionally," but not in matters of administration.

(3) *A Local Secondary Authority*, nominated for five years partly by the local County Council, partly by the above Central Authority, and recruited partly by co-optation. In county-boroughs, the Borough Council and School Board were to take the place of the County Council in the business of nomination.

These Local Authorities were to make provision for secondary instruction where it is lacking, help existing institutions so long as they complied with certain conditions of efficiency, control all endowed and aided schools absolutely and all schools whatsoever in regard to sanitary arrangements. The aid was to be drawn from endowments, government grants, and rates, and would have amounted to about £3,250,000 per annum.

Examinations were to be controlled by the Educational Coun-

cil, and provision was made for the appointment and control of *Inspectors*, the regulating of the *Appointment and Dismissal of Teachers*, the graduation of *Salaries*, the establishment of a *Register of Teachers* approved as competent, and insistence on *Training* as an important qualification for registration.

Colonel Lockwood's Bill was drafted by the Incorporated Association of Head Masters, as already stated.

(1) It extends the powers of the existing *Education Department* of the Government over elementary education to secondary education, and transfers to it all the powers and duties of the Charity Commission and such powers of the Science and Art Department as relate to secondary education.

(2) The Education Department is to make inquiries and publish reports as to the nature and extent of the provision of secondary education. *Grants* are to be made in aid of secondary education by the Department out of the existing Science and Art Department funds and other funds to be supplied by parliament.

(3) Secondary schools, with certain exceptions, are to be visited by Education Department *Inspectors* or be subject to inspection by Universities approved by the following Advisory Council.

(4) An *Advisory Council* is to be established, under the chairmanship of the Lord President of the Privy Council, or the Vice-President of the Committee of the Privy Council on Education, consisting, without qualification of sex, of nominees of the Crown, the Universities, professional bodies, and local educational authorities, and representatives of teachers duly registered under the act.

The Bill also includes provisions for the creation of *Registers* of efficient secondary schools, and of persons qualified to teach therein. It accepts the County Councils as the *Local Educational Authorities*.

I come now to the Government Board of Education Bill.

(1) This Bill proposes to establish a *Board of Education*, differing little from the existing Committee of the Privy Council on Education, for England and Wales in place of the present

Education Department and Department of Science and Art. The Board is to consist of the Lord President of the Council, the Principal Secretaries of State, the First Commissioner of the Treasury, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and one other member appointed by the Crown, which may also appoint a President and Vice-President of the Board. The latter may be a member of parliament.

(2) The Board is to exercise the existing powers of the Charity Commissioners, except with regard to questions affecting the construction of the schemes of endowed schools or the management of endowment funds. But, in framing schemes under the Endowed Schools Acts, 1869-1889, the Commissioners must act in consultation with the Board.

(3) The Board has full powers to send *Inspectors* and *Examiners*, and give certificates as to teaching, to any school, whether endowed or not; but, in the latter case, the consent of the governors of the school must be obtained.

(4) Powers are given to the Crown to appoint from time to time by order in Council a *Consultative Committee* to advise the Board on any matter it may choose to refer to this committee.

No provision is made for *Local Authorities*; but there is nothing in the Bill to prevent the proposed Board from utilizing the local machinery of the Science and Art Department and coöperating with the County Councils.¹

One of the Government Bills of 1896 was a separate Teachers' Registration Bill, which was never even discussed. This Bill was re-introduced on August 1 at the same time as the Board of Education Bill and will doubtless be brought in with it again at the beginning of next session.

This Bill provides for a *Council*, which may include women, consisting of six nominees of the Crown, one from each of the six English universities, and six representatives of registered teachers—two secondary, two elementary, and two from the

¹In making the above synoptic comparisons of the English Education Bills, I have availed myself of the assistance offered by the admirable parallel exposition published in the September issue of the *Educational Times*, to which I would refer those of my readers who care to go more deeply into the question.

general body of registered teachers. Till this register is constituted the representatives of teachers are to be elected by the six leading associations of teachers mentioned in my last letter.

This Council is to make and keep a correct *Register* of teachers in England and Wales and frame rules for their admission. The conditions of admission are to be a recognized university degree, a recognized certificate of adequate knowledge of the theory and practice of education and practical efficiency in teaching, and approved moral character. All class distinctions are to be expressly ignored. The Council may admit persons not possessing the above qualifications under special circumstances and remove from the register, after due notice, the names of teachers convicted of misconduct. The register is to be both alphabetical and classified according to the class of institution in which the teacher is serving, and be published annually. There is also provision for the registration of teachers who are qualified in special branches of instruction, but have not the full qualifications for the general register. The difficulties of retrospective action are met by including in the general register forthwith, or within three years after its inception, all approved and competent persons who have been engaged in actual teaching for a term of more than three years before the passing of the act.

Such are the two government bills for the organization of secondary education in England. They were introduced and printed at the end of the last session in order that they might be thoroughly discussed by educationists during the autumn and winter recess, and will be re-introduced in the coming session of parliament to undergo the usual process of debate and be, without doubt, greatly modified. But they are both merely bills—proposals as yet unratified by the approval of parliament. The University of London Bill has become an Act and is now in the statute book. I shall preface its main features with a brief history of the agitation, extending over more than twelve years, which led up to it.

The University of London has been described as a “nebula floating in space” and also as a “paper university,” because it

has no residential aspect and confines its examination largely to written papers. Reforms have been effected in the latter direction; but the present attempt to make changes in the former direction involves reconstruction so comprehensive that many consider it will mean destruction. The absence of a residential qualification for a degree in the University of London has brought its diplomas within the reach of thousands of men and women who could never afford the cost of residence, and of yet other thousands to whom, for various reasons, the taking of a degree did not become a practical question till they were settled down in permanent occupations, which left nothing but the leisure hours of the evening for self-culture. While the peculiar facilities offered by such a non-residential, non-teaching, and purely examining university for obtaining the hall-mark of a diploma have done not a little to carry culture where the older universities had no *locus standi*, these very facilities have made largely for evil in two directions. They have bred a species of culture which is only skin deep, being fed merely on the educational pemmican supplied by professional "crammers" and "coaches," as they are called, and entirely innocent of the deeper social, circumstantial, and intellectual culture which broods in the atmosphere of the time-honored haunts of learning; and, while there has been some gain in breadth and intellectual tolerance, there has been a corresponding loss in depth and intellectual selectiveness. Again, the examinations themselves, lacking the ballast of an intimate connection with the class-room and the lecture-hall, have soared away into a gymnastic of intellectual acuteness and, it is not too much to say, intellectual astuteness, which rises ever higher and higher above the rational capacities of a sound education and a healthy mental and physical development.

The sense of this unscientific condition of university functions at length became so general among educationists that an agitation was commenced to effect some drastic reform. In 1894 a Royal Commission was appointed, with Lord Cowper as Chairman, to examine certain proposals for organizing University education in London by means of a separate University to be called

the Gresham University.¹ The proposals for this separate university were wrecked by the opposition of the existing University and other educational bodies, whose interests had not been sufficiently considered by the two great London colleges, University and King's, that promoted the proposals. The subsequent proposals of the Royal Commissioners anent the same scheme also failed because, though more liberal than those of the original promoters, they appeared to many people of weight and influence to disregard the essential conditions of the admittedly valuable work of the existing University as an imperial examining board. The issue of these proposals split the London graduates into three parties. One of the three parties gave a general approval to the Cowper scheme. The two others opposed it, but for different reasons—one because it wished the local London work of the University to be done by a separate (Gresham) university in accordance with the proposals of the original promoters of the scheme; the other because, as already mentioned, the recommendations of the commissioners did not appear to safeguard the work of the existing University as an imperial examining board. The net result of the controversy which followed was to settle public opinion against the establishment of a second University of London and towards the reorganization of the existing University and the extension of its functions. Bills were introduced into parliament in 1895 and 1896 to give effect to this scheme of reorganization and extension, but were not carried through on account of disagreement as to details not affecting the central principle. The gist of this disagreement was, on the one hand, the feeling of the London teachers that, under the Cowper scheme, they would be unable to control the education of their pupils, because it gave them no voice in the regulation of the syllabus of examinations; and, on the other hand, the feeling of the University that it could not maintain the independence of its external examinations, if Lon-

¹ For a fuller history of this agitation, see a "Note on the Occasion, Effect, and Expediency of the Compromise embodied in the London University Commission Bill, 1898, by some Members of Convocation, who took part in negotiating it in the interests of the present work of the University." Pamphlet of 34 pages. Published by Eyre and Gale, New Square, Lincoln's Inn, London.

don teachers controlled the syllabus of subjects. A compromise was at length reached in the formation of a dual system of machinery for the performance of the dual functions of a University conducting both internal London and external imperial examinations, and catering for the needs of both collegiate and non-collegiate students.

This is the history of the agitation which at length found practical expression in the Act of 1898, which gives statutory powers to a small body of Commissioners to make regulations for a reorganized and extended University of London, the hands of the Commissioners being tied, however, by certain provisions scheduled to the Act, which cannot be altered by any authority short of an act of parliament.

I have not space to go into the details of the Act, which must be left till I give an account of the criticisms passed upon it. Suffice it to say here that the provisions of the schedule create in effect a dual University with two sides, furnished each with appropriate machinery—one to control the external and imperial examinations and give degrees without any qualification of training by the teachers of the University, the other to organize and develop internal university education in London. Both sides are controlled by a Senate upon which the teaching and the examining elements are for the first time fairly proportioned. The elements of the machinery are the senate; three standing committees of the Senate, *i. e.*, an Academic Council, a Council for External Students, and a Board to Promote the Extension of University Teaching; Convocation; Schools of the University, Teachers of the University; Faculties, Boards of Studies, and Examinations.

Thus, after years of chaos, English education appears at last to be on the threshold of order and scientific organization. The union of Plebs and Patricians in ancient Rome closed the era of confusion, and laid the foundation of a homogeneous growth of such strength that it at last overshadowed the civilized world of antiquity and struck its roots deep into the heart of all time. It may be that this first attempt to consolidate chaotic educational effort in the ancestral home of the masters of the major part of

the habitable globe will start a similar growth. Some day, perhaps, far in the future, English education will have become a power strong enough to mold the intellect of the whole earth into a form of beauty and strength, beside which the boasted intelligence of the present day will be only a memory of reproach and a cause of wonder to those who, in ages yet to come, inherit the name and power of the Anglo-Saxon race.

WILLIAM K. HILL

LONDON, ENG.